

立法會

Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)891/06-07

Ref : CB1/PL/PS

Panel on Public Service Meeting on 8 February 2007

Background brief

Follow-up actions taken by the Legislative Council and the Government in relation to the Hong Kong Harbour Fest

Purpose

This paper sets out the background to the disciplinary case in relation to the Hong Kong Harbour Fest (the Harbour Fest) and outlines the major findings by the Director of Audit, the Public Accounts Committee (PAC), and the Independent Panel of Inquiry on the Harbour Fest on how the matter should be followed up. The paper also summarizes the concerns and queries raised by Members on the actions taken by the Administration in determining whether any officer(s) should be held responsible and on the way disciplinary proceedings were conducted.

Background

2. On 23 April 2003, the Chief Executive (CE) announced a package of relief measures amounting to \$11.8 billion to help the community tide over the difficulties and revive Hong Kong's economy and international image as a result of the outbreak of the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome. These measures included a commitment of \$1 billion approved by the Finance Committee (FC) of the Legislative Council on 30 May 2003 to provide funds for the campaign to relaunch Hong Kong's economy (the Relaunch Campaign). The Director-General of Investment Promotion (DGIP), head of Invest Hong Kong (InvestHK) and secretary to the two ad hoc bodies established to advise on and to coordinate the relaunching programme, was designated as the Controlling Officer responsible for administering the \$1 billion commitment for the Relaunch Campaign.
3. The two ad hoc bodies, both chaired by the Financial Secretary (FS), were established by the Government:

- (a) the Economic Relaunch Strategy Group (ERSG), which comprised government officials and members of the business community, academics and other relevant parties, to give advice on the strategic

approach for relaunching Hong Kong; and

- (b) the Economic Relaunch Working Group (ERWG), which comprised the same government officials in the ERSG, to oversee and coordinate the implementation of the various relaunch programmes.

4. In response to the Relaunch Campaign, on 5 June 2003, the American Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong (AmCham) proposed to organize an entertainment showcase festival, which was later named the Harbour Fest. It was scheduled to be held at the Tamar site on Harcourt Road from 17 October to 9 November 2003. On 2 July 2003, AmCham presented its proposal to the ERWG which supported the proposal in principle. On 12 July 2003, the ERWG approved a maximum of \$100 million to InvestHK for underwriting the Harbour Fest to be organized by AmCham.

5. Various problems were encountered during the organization of the Harbour Fest concerts, leading to a great deal of negative publicity and public concern over the financial arrangements and the cost-effectiveness of the event. The Panel on Financial Affairs (FA Panel) decided to conduct meetings to review the related matters with the Administration. In the light of the concern expressed by the FA Panel and the general public, the Audit Commission commenced a review on the Harbour Fest in late October 2003 and the Chief Executive also appointed a two-member independent panel of inquiry to investigate into the event in December 2003.

Audit Review

6. The Audit Commission commenced a review to examine the Administration's role in the planning, monitoring and implementation of the Harbour Fest in late October 2003. The results were published in Chapter 4 of the Director of Audit's Report No. 42, which was tabled at the Council on 21 April 2004. One of the key observations was that DGIP's adoption of a "hands-off" approach in overseeing and monitoring the project was not adequate to satisfy the requirement. The key observations of the Director of Audit are set out in **Appendix I**.

Independent Panel of Inquiry on the Harbour Fest

7. The two-member Independent Panel of Inquiry appointed by the CE presented its report to CE in mid May 2004. Its key conclusions included criticism on InvestHK that it did not diligently follow the instruction of ERWG to scrutinize and approve the evolving budget of the Harbour Fest; and that InvestHK also failed to institute a proper monitoring framework for the event and DGIP had failed to adequately discharge the role of Controlling Officer of the HK\$100 million sponsorship fee. The key conclusions of the report are set out in **Appendix II**.

8. On 17 May 2004, CE stated that he accepted the findings and recommendations of the Panel of Inquiry and that the Government would further examine the report carefully to determine any necessary follow-up action by the Government. CE had also asked the Secretary for the Civil Service to consider whether any action needed to be taken in respect of any officer.

Inquiry by the FA Panel

9. In the meantime, the FA Panel continued to examine the various issues surrounding the Harbour Fest. On 14 June 2004, the FA Panel invited FS, DGIP, and Mr James THOMPSON, former Chairman of AmCham, to explain on the cost benefits of the Harbour Fest, in particular the low viewing rate of the TV special broadcast in USA. While Mr THOMPSON maintained that the event was successfully held, members reiterated that where public funds were involved, it was of paramount importance that all parties should be vigilant in exercising control over the use of tax-payers' money and in achieving the objectives of the project. Members were disappointed to note that the Government had not played an effective role in monitoring the implementation of the event. They questioned the appropriateness of the Government to underwrite the shortfall of the event and to give a complete free hand to AmCham to organize such a large-scale event through a private company, Red Canvas Limited, owned by the then Chairman of AmCham. Given the low attendance rate of 125 900 for the 16 concerts, members further questioned if the objectives of boosting the local economy and promoting tourism had been achieved. The Administration advised that in the light of the observations and recommendations of the two reports, the Administration would strengthen measures to improve the process for committing government funds on specific projects and would consider providing training on crisis communication for senior officials.

PAC's inquiry

10. The PAC, on the basis of the Director of Audit's Report No. 42, conducted its inquiry and tabled its report at the Council meeting on 23 June 2004. In its report, the PAC condemns DGIP for his failure to, inter alia, take positive steps to consult the government bureau and departments with expertise in the entertainment field, engage outside experts in the show business, or make reference to their relevant practices during the critical initial stages of budget vetting and monitoring processes; and adhere to the basic management principles and put in place an appropriate system of cost control or monitoring to oversee the project. The PAC urged the Administration to consider taking disciplinary action against the DGIP having regard to the gravity of his failure in discharging his duties. The conclusions and recommendations of the PAC are set out in **Appendix III**.

11. On 20 October 2004, the Chief Secretary for Administration (CS) presented a Government Minute to LegCo to respond to PAC's Report. CS advised the Council

that the Administration agreed that all concerned parties could have done better in many respects. He also said that “the Civil Service Bureau has been tasked by the Chief Executive to examine the possible culpability of any civil servants involved in the Harbour Fest incident. The Bureau has completed the collation of relevant facts and evidence relating to the manner in which civil servants carried out their duties in connection with Harbour Fest..... The Bureau has also invited and received representations from an officer who faces a possible charge of misconduct. After giving the representations careful consideration, the Secretary for Civil Service decided to institute formal disciplinary proceedings, including an inquiry, to decide if the officer is guilty of misconduct.”

Disciplinary proceedings

12. According to the Administration, disciplinary proceedings against the officer referred to by the CS commenced on 28 September 2004 and were concluded on 3 October 2005. During the proceedings, the inquiry committee had conducted a hearing made up of 12 (half-day) sessions.

13. When notified of the decisions made by the Secretary for the Civil Service on the outcome of the proceedings, the officer concerned appealed to the CE under section 20 of the Public Service (Administration) Order against the Secretary's decision. In response to questions raised by Members at the Council meetings on 24 May 2006 and 20 December 2006, the Administration advised that the appeal was being dealt with in accordance with established procedures. It would give an account of the outcome of the disciplinary proceedings to the LegCo after the appeal has been disposed of.

Relevant papers

14. A list of relevant papers and reports is in **Appendix IV** for members' reference.

Hong Kong Harbour Fest

Key observations of the Report of the Director of Audit

The key observations of "Chapter 4 - Hong Kong Harbour Fest" of Report No. 42 of the Director of Audit tabled at LegCo in April 2004 are summarized as follows:

- (a) There were inadequate information and analysis on the project risks to enable the Government to conduct a proper assessment of the project, before accepting the American Chamber of Commerce (AmCham)'s proposal (*paragraph 2.12 of the Report*).
- (b) There was no documentary evidence that the Government had, instead of sponsoring the Harbour Fest organized by AmCham, considered taking over the Harbour Fest project and explored the options of organizing the concerts in-house and outsourcing the project to the private sector by selecting the organizer through a competitive selection process (*paragraph 2.17 of the Report*).
- (c) The detailed budget submitted by AmCham on 6 July 2003, which formed the basis for the Economic Relaunch Working Group (ERWG) to approve AmCham's proposal, might be indicative only. InvestHK should have conducted a more thorough vetting of the budget and, if necessary, sought expert assistance in conducting the vetting (*paragraph 2.26 of the Report*).
- (d) The arrangement to finance the Harbour Fest in the form of sponsorship was not in line with the good practices set out in the relevant government guidelines for the management of government subventions (*paragraph 2.32 of the Report*).
- (e) An effective monitoring mechanism should have been set up for the Harbour Fest (*paragraph 3.4 of the Report*).
- (f) The Director-General of Investment Promotion's adoption of a "hands-off" approach in overseeing and monitoring the project was not adequate to satisfy the requirement (*paragraph 3.10 of the Report*).
- (g) InvestHK had not adequately monitored the implementation of the Harbour Fest against the approved plan to ensure that the original business idea endorsed by ERWG was not materially altered without proper approval (*paragraph 3.16 of the Report*).

- (h) InvestHK should have played a more active role in monitoring AmCham to ensure compliance with the understanding/conditions on which the Harbour Fest project was approved by ERWG (*paragraph 3.19 of the Report*).
- (i) As the Harbour Fest was a mega event under the Campaign to Relaunch Hong Kong's Economy, more frequent briefings on the progress of the project should have been provided to the Panel on Financial Affairs (*paragraph 3.25 of the Report*).
- (j) No risk management and contingency plan was prepared by the Government to formally identify, analyze and address the project risks (*paragraph 3.28 of the Report*).
- (k) The average number of tickets sold at 43% of the total capacity of all concerts was not satisfactory (*paragraph 4.9 of the Report*). The result indicates that the concerts had fallen short of expectation and that some of the concerts were not well attended (*paragraph 5.9 of the Report*).
- (l) The number of free tickets issued represents some 30% of the audience turnout. There were complaints that giving away tickets was unfair to other persons who had paid for their tickets (*paragraph 4.11 of the Report*).
- (m) The uncertainty and confusion surrounding the Rolling Stones concerts gave the impression that the organizing of the concerts was not well coordinated (*paragraph 4.27 of the Report*).
- (n) There is little prospect of having the TV film aired on ABC network and the target of having 100 million TV homes viewed the TV film in the USA has evidently not been met (*paragraph 5.10 of the Report*).

Hong Kong Harbour Fest

**Key conclusions of the
Report of the Independent Panel of Inquiry on the Harbour Fest**

Report of the Independent Panel of Inquiry

The key conclusions of the Report of the Independent Panel of Inquiry are summarized as follows:

- (a) ERWG approved the Harbour Fest project without adequate assessment. InvestHK did not render adequate support to ERWG in the assessment process either (*paragraph 16 of the Executive Summary of the Report*).
- (b) AmCham did not ensure that an appropriate organizing committee was established to oversee the Harbour Fest event in order that a structured approach and an effective management and financial control framework for the event were in place (*paragraph 17 of the Executive Summary of the Report*).
- (c) The three-member Harbour Fest Organizing Committee was handicapped by their lack of knowledge in concert promotion and their lack of acquaintance with experts in the field (*paragraph 18 of the Executive Summary of the Report*).
- (d) There was a failure on the part of the Harbour Fest Organizing Committee to ensure there was an appropriate organizing and financial control structure put in place to tightly manage and control the organization process of the event, financially and operationally (*paragraph 20 of the Executive Summary of the Report*).
- (e) East Art International Limited, the western talent co-ordinator for the Harbour Fest, was not as experienced and established as it represented to Red Canvas Limited per the talent acquisition agreement (*paragraph 21 of the Executive Summary of the Report*).
- (f) There appears to have been some degree of overpayment to most of the western artists for performing at the Harbour Fest (*paragraph 22 of the Executive Summary of the Report*).
- (g) InvestHK did not diligently follow the instruction of ERWG to scrutinize and approve the evolving budget of the Harbour Fest (*paragraph 28 of the Executive Summary of the Report*).

- (h) InvestHK also failed to institute a proper monitoring framework for the event when discharging its responsibility as the subject department of the Harbour Fest. DGIP had failed to adequately discharge the role of Controlling Officer of the HK\$100 million sponsorship fee (*paragraph 29 of the Executive Summary of the Report*).
- (i) Both the Harbour Fest Organizing Committee and the Government had missed out on this one key success factor for the event, namely, to positively and pro-actively engage the public to buy in to the Harbour Fest (*paragraph 31 of the Executive Summary of the Report*).
- (j) The Harbour Fest Organizing Committee failed to recognize the fundamental need for transparency and accountability in the disbursement of the \$100 million sponsorship fee, three quarters of which were spent on western talent acquisition (*paragraph 33 of the Executive Summary of the Report*).
- (k) The departure from good government practice by DGIP and InvestHK in forfeiting the reserve power of access to contracts and records of the Harbour Fest was also a failure in good stewardship expected of every level of Government (*paragraph 34 of the Executive Summary of the Report*).
- (l) Technically, the broadcast in the US had by and large reached the number of television households promised by the Organizing Committee in July 2003, though likely of a different profile. But the estimated aggregate rating of the programme for the three airings on the US networks was low (*paragraph 35 of the Executive Summary of the Report*).
- (m) The Harbour Fest did not achieve its three strategic objectives, namely to boost local morale, attract short-haul visitors and to show the world that Hong Kong had recovered (*paragraph 37 of the Executive Summary of the Report*).
- (n) Each of the parties involved in the Harbour Fest at the project assessment, approval, implementation and monitoring stages fell short of the Panel's expectation of good governance, business prudence and professionalism in the organization of an event of such nature and magnitude. They were all responsible in their respective ways (*paragraph 38 of the Executive Summary of the Report*).

Public Accounts Committee Report No. 42

**Conclusion and recommendations
regarding Hong Kong Harbour Fest**

120. **Conclusions and recommendations** The Committee:

Project conceptualisation and approval

- expresses grave dismay that the Economic Relaunch Working Group (ERWG) had put a substantial amount of public fund at risk as early as the inception stage of the event by approving too hastily the American Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong (AmCham)'s proposal for the Government to sponsor the Harbour Fest (HF), in that it:

Hong Kong Harbour Fest

- (a) failed to thoroughly assess the complexity and risks involved, as well as the benefits, before agreeing to support the proposal in principle;
 - (b) failed to ask for a proper business plan from AmCham, thus depriving itself of the detailed information required (such as market analysis, risk assessment and human resource plan) for conducting a proper project appraisal;
 - (c) failed to call for the views of experts within the relevant departments on the feasibility of the HF despite the initial reaction of the departments that the project was rather ambitious;
 - (d) appointed the Invest Hong Kong (InvestHK), which had little hands-on experience in organising such mega event, as the subject department without considering other available options; and
 - (e) failed to explore the options of organising the concerts in-house, outsourcing to the private sector through a competitive selection process or co-organising the HF with AmCham;
- notes that the Financial Secretary (FS) has accepted Audit's observation that the ERWG had not fully examined the concept viability, the timeframe for organising the concerts, the timeframe for promotion and ticketing, and the organising ability of AmCham, before it accepted AmCham's proposal for the Government to sponsor the HF;

Project monitoring

- condemns the Director-General of Investment Promotion (DGIP) for the reasons that he:
- (a) failed to take positive steps to consult the government bureau and departments with expertise in the entertainment field, engage outside experts in the show business, or make reference to their relevant practices during the critical initial stages of budget-vetting and monitoring processes;
 - (b) failed to seek the Department of Justice (DoJ)'s advice on the three Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with AmCham, which are legally binding;

Hong Kong Harbour Fest

- (c) rejected the DoJ's advice to include in the agreement with AmCham provisions for access to documents in AmCham's possession; and
- (d) failed to adhere to the basic management principles and to put in place an appropriate system of cost control or monitoring to oversee the project. In particular, he:
 - (i) failed to adequately supervise InvestHK in the discharge of his responsibilities over the HF, which was evidenced by:
 - the fact that he was absent from Hong Kong for 60 days during the three-month period leading up to the HF; and
 - his ignorance of the fact that two legally binding MOUs were signed during his absence and \$50 million were paid to AmCham;
 - (ii) failed to conduct any due diligence checks on AmCham and Red Canvas Limited and to inquire into AmCham's ability to pay the difference between the cost of the HF and the government sponsorship;
 - (iii) failed to ensure that there were proper risk management and contingency planning on the HF; and
 - (iv) chose to rely on a liberal interpretation of "sponsorship" in order to justify his monitoring the HF from a distance;
- concurs with the FS that irrespective of whether the HF is financed by the Government through sponsorship or other modes of subvention, the responsibilities of the Controlling Officers remain the same as those provided in FCir No. 1/2004, i.e. they should satisfy themselves that an appropriate system of cost control or monitoring is in place;
- expresses serious dismay that the ERWG:
 - (a) failed to carry out appropriate supervision over such crucial matters as InvestHK's scrutiny of the budget for the HF and the InvestHK's monitoring of the actual progress of the organisation of HF;

Hong Kong Harbour Fest

- (b) failed to ensure that the DGIP exercise the appropriate level of supervision over the sponsorship of the HF which is effectively close to its full cost; and
- (c) had not considered downsizing the scale of the HF;

Keeping the Legislative Council (LegCo) informed

- expresses serious dismay that the DGIP failed to discharge his responsibility to keep the LegCo informed by providing reliable and complete information in a timely manner, in that he:
 - (a) failed to act on his undertaking to keep the LegCo informed on a regular basis until 11 October 2003 when he was required to respond to concerns raised by the public over the organisation of the HF;
 - (b) misled the LegCo into believing that AmCham had already secured the broadcast of the whole one-hour TV special by the ABC Channel in the USA and that the film would be brought to 0.5 billion viewers worldwide, which ultimately did not materialise; and
 - (c) failed to inform the LegCo that there were substantive differences in the Government's monitoring role between commissioning other Relaunch Campaign projects and just acting as a sponsor for the HF;
- notes that the DGIP has accepted that he could have requested the Financial Affairs Panel to call special meetings or submitted written reports to the Panel during the summer recess of the LegCo, to brief the Panel about the HF;

Organisation of the HF

- expresses serious concern that:
 - (a) although the HF was expected to generate positive publicity, the vast majority of the media reports on the HF were negative;
 - (b) the overall audience turnout rate for the HF concerts was only 61%, including 18% being holders of free tickets;
 - (c) the ticket sales position was not satisfactory as tickets sold represented only 43% of the total capacity of all concerts, with the number of tickets sold for individual concerts varying from 15% to 89% of concert capacity;

Hong Kong Harbour Fest

- (d) the distribution of a large number of free tickets, amounting to 30% of the audience turnout, gave the impression that the concerts were not well received by the market and the distribution of too many free tickets in the earlier concerts could have affected the ticket sales for some of the subsequent concerts;
 - (e) the three months allowed for the organisation of the HF, involving a total of 16 high profile performances by international, regional and local artists, were grossly inadequate;
 - (f) because of the insufficient time for organising the HF, the programme line-up was only completed at a very late stage, which in turn affected the time allowed for the promotion of individual artists and the time available for ticket sales; and
 - (g) the significant changes in the line-up of artists had resulted in the late completion of the final programme line-up which affected the time allowed for the promotion of individual performances and the time available for ticket sales;
- acknowledges the assurance by the FS that the Administration will follow up the outstanding tasks that require monitoring by the Government;

Rolling Stones concerts

- expresses serious concern that:
 - (a) the Rolling Stones concerts were included late in the programme line-up for the HF in late August 2003, leaving little lead time for the smooth organisation of concerts of such high international profile;
 - (b) the concerts had caused uncertainty and confusion and attracted a lot of negative media attention, which gave the impression that the organising of the concerts was not well coordinated; and
 - (c) in organising these concerts, AmCham incurred a substantial loss at taxpayers' expense, although the number of tickets sold was 25% of the overall tickets sold for the HF concerts, and their audience turnout was 19% of the total audience turnout;

Hong Kong Harbour Fest

Evaluation of the HF

- expresses dismay that the agreement between AmCham and the Government only required the delivery of a programme of events and the TV production without providing safeguards and measurable criteria to ensure that the stated objectives of the HF (i.e. boosting local morale and consumption, boosting tourism and promoting Hong Kong to international and Mainland communities) would be achieved. In the event, the Government's interests were left unprotected in that:
 - (a) the HF concerts had fallen short of expectations and some of the concerts were not well attended;
 - (b) the TV film was not aired on the ABC network and the three airings in the USA only achieved less than 1% of the target viewership; and
 - (c) to date, the viewership of the TV film worldwide has been far lower than the target viewership;

Follow-up actions

- urges InvestHK to liaise with AmCham to make arrangements for the Government to have access to all HF records of AmCham, Red Canvas Limited and the project subcontractors, in order to facilitate any necessary follow-up actions by the Government and the Audit Commission;
- invites the Director of Audit to consider conducting a value for money audit on other events and activities sponsored by InvestHK to ensure that they did not similarly suffer from the lack of proper cost control;
- urges the Administration to consider taking disciplinary action against the DGIP, having regard to the gravity of his failure in discharging his duties; and
- wishes to be kept informed of the developments in following up the outstanding tasks of the HF and the progress on the implementation of Audit's recommendations.

Hong Kong Harbour Fest

List of relevant papers and reports

Paper/Report	LC Paper No.
Background brief on the "Campaign to re-launch Hong Kong's economy" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat for the FA Panel	CB(1)14/03-04(01) <i>(issued on 6 October 2003)</i>
Paper on "Update on the campaign to relaunch Hong Kong's economy" provided by the Administration, with copies of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Membership list of ERSG and ERWG; ● Economic Relaunch Programme — Summary of Approved Funding Allocations (updated as at 17 September 2003); and ● Harbour Fest Budget (as at 22 September 2003) 	CB(1)14/03-04(02) <i>(issued on 6 October 2003)</i>
Letter dated 14 October 2003 to the Financial Secretary seeking the Administration's clarification on the Rolling Stones' participation in the Hong Kong Harbour Fest	CB(1)79/03-04(01) <i>(issued on 15 October 2003)</i>
Reply dated 17 October 2003 from DGIP providing clarification on the participation of Rolling Stones in the Hong Kong Harbour Fest	CB(1)110/03-04(01) <i>(English version issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)110/03-04 issued on 18 October 2003)</i> <i>(Chinese version issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)120/03-04 on 21 October 2003)</i>
Paper on "Supplementary information on activities of the campaign to relaunch Hong Kong's economy", with copies of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Economic Relaunch Programme — Summary of Approved Funding Allocations (updated as at 17 October 2003); and ● Budget summary of Harbour Fest Budget 	CB(1)111/03-04(02) <i>(English version issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)111/03-04 issued on 20 October 2003)</i> <i>(Chinese version issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)337/03-04 issued on 14 November 2003)</i>

Paper/Report	LC Paper No.
<p>Letter dated 25 October 2003 from DGIP to the Clerk to FA Panel, with copies of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the Agreement dated 10 October 2003 signed between the Government and AmCham in relation to the Harbour Fest; and ● list of ticket prices for the Harbour Fest concerts. 	<p>CB(1)162/03-04(01) <i>(English version issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)162/03-04 on 27 October 2003)</i> <i>(Chinese version issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)289/03-04 on 7 November 2003)</i></p>
<p>Press release and note to editors on "Intellectual Property Rights" and "Payment in Advance" issued by the Administration on 28 October 2003</p>	<p>CB(1)201/03-04(01) <i>(issued on 29 October 2003)</i></p>
<p>Letter dated 24 October 2003 from Hon SIN Chung-kai to the Chairman of the Panel with a list of questions on Harbour Fest</p>	<p>CB(1)124/03-04(01) <i>(Chinese version only)</i> <i>(issued on 30 October 2003)</i></p>
<p>Reply dated 30 October 2003 from DGIP to the Clerk to FA Panel, with copies of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● three MoUs signed between the Government and AmCham in relation to the Harbour Fest on 31 July, 29 August and 3 October 2003; and ● the MoU signed between AmCham and Red Canvas Limited on 13 August 2003. 	<p>CB(1)224/03-04(01) <i>(English version only)</i> <i>(issued on 31 October 2003)</i></p>
<p>Press release on "Government response on intellectual property rights and custodian of rights for Harbour Fest" issued by the Administration on 29 October 2003</p>	<p>CB(1)276/03-04(01) <i>(issued on 6 November 2003)</i></p>
<p>Media statement on "Production of the Harbour Fest TV special" issued by the Organizing Committee of the Harbour Fest on 4 November 2003</p>	<p>CB(1)276/03-04(02) <i>(issued on 6 November 2003)</i></p>
<p>Paper on "Supplementary information on Harbour Fest" provided by the Administration on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Process of Organization and Implementation; and ● Responses to specific issues raised by Hon SIN Chung-kai. 	<p>CB(1)304/03-04(01) <i>(English version issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)305/03-04 issued on 11 November 2003)</i> <i>(Chinese version issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)319/03-04 issued on 12 November 2003)</i></p>

Paper/Report	LC Paper No.
A list of 16 questions raised by Hon Fred LI Wah-ming on Harbour Fest	CB(1)337/03-04(01) <i>(Chinese version only)</i> <i>(issued on 14 November 2003)</i>
Provisional statement of out turn of revenue and expenditure of Harbour Fest tabled at the FA Panel meeting on 15 November 2003	CB(1)342/03-04(01) <i>(English version issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)342/03-04 issued on 17 November 2003)</i> <i>(Chinese version issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)350/03-04 issued on 18 November 2003)</i>
Administration's reply dated 24 November 2003 to questions raised by Hon Fred LI Wah-ming	CB(1)422/03-04(01) <i>(issued on 25 November 2003)</i>
Press releases issued by the Government on 12 December 2003 on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CE's appointment of members to Independent Panel of Inquiry on Harbour Fest; and ● Statement by members of the Independent Panel of Inquiry on the Harbour Fest 	CB(1)596/03-04(01) and (02) <i>(issued on 16 December 2003)</i>
Paper on "Observations on Clause 9.2 of the Agreement dated 10 October 2003 and made between the Government of HKSAR and AmCham in relation to the "Harbour Fest"" prepared by Legal Service Division of the Legislative Council Secretariat	LS48/03-04 <i>(issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1185/03-04 on 3 March 2004)</i>
Report of the Progress of the Campaign to Relaunch Hong Kong's Economy, with copies of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Economic Relaunch Programme — Progress Report of Approved Funding Allocations; ● Audited accounts of the Harbour Fest; ● Income and expenditure for the Harbour Fest; and ● Attendance for the Harbour Fest. 	CB(1)1491/03-04(01) <i>(English version issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1491/03-04 on 8 April 2004)</i> <i>(Chinese version issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1501/03-04 on 13 April 2004)</i>

Paper/Report	LC Paper No.
<p>Paper on "Hong Kong Harbour Fest" provided by the Administration, with copies of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The detailed profit and loss accounts of Red Canvas Limited in relation to Harbour Fest; and ● The broadcast schedule of Harbour Fest TV special. 	<p>CB(1)2083/03-04(05) <i>(English version issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)2083/03-04 on 8 June 2004)</i> <i>(Chinese version issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)2129/03-04 on 11 June 2004)</i></p>
<p>Chapter 4 of the Report of the Director of Audit No. 42 — Hong Kong Harbour Fest</p>	<p><i>(Tabled at the Council meeting on 21 April 2004)</i></p>
<p>Report by the Independent Panel of Inquiry on the Harbour Fest</p>	<p>CB(1)1853/03-04 <i>(English version only)</i> <i>(issued on 17 May 2004)</i></p>
<p>Minutes of special meeting of FA Panel on 11 October 2003</p>	<p>CB(1)305/03-04 <i>(issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)369/03-04 on 19 November 2004)</i></p>
<p>Minutes of special meeting of FA Panel on 15 November 2003</p>	<p>CB(1)857/03-04 <i>(issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)880/03-04 on 30 January 2004)</i></p>
<p>Hansard of the Council meetings on 5 November 2003, 17 December 2003, 14 January 2004 and 4 February 2004</p>	<p><i>Issued</i></p>
<p>Background brief on the “Hong Kong Harbour Fest” prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat for the FA Panel</p>	<p>CB(1)2083/03-04(04) <i>(issued on 11 June 2004)</i></p>
<p>The Public Accounts Committee’s Report No. 42</p>	<p><i>(tabled at the Council meeting on 23 June 2004)</i></p>
<p>The Government Minute responding to Public Accounts Committee Report No. 42</p>	<p><i>(tabled at the Council meeting on 20 October 2004)</i></p>
<p>Question No. 4 raised by Hon Audrey EU in Hansard of the Council meeting on 24 May 2006</p>	<p><i>Issued</i></p>
<p>The press release issued by the Government on the question and answer given on the disciplinary proceedings arising from the Hong Kong Harbour Fest at the Council meeting on 20 December 2006</p>	